REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 25-30 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 1-3, 12-16, 18-21 and 26-29 are sought to be amended. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has maintained the objection to the specification for not including a "Summary" Section. The Examiner acknowledges that the "Summary" Section is optional in the final office action dated February 16, 2005. Applicant respectfully has submitted a petition under CFR § 1.113 and 1.181 for reconsideration of the Examiner's objection to the specification. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection and any requirement related thereto be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,207 (hereinafter referred to as "the Petersen patent").

Applicant assumes that dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Petersen patent. Applicant respectfully

traverses this rejection since the Petersen patent does not teach or suggest each element of

independent claims 1 and 12 for at least the following reason.

In one embodiment of the invention of the instant application, a switch-box is used to

provide a convenient way to cut/copy information from a first computer system and to then

paste that information to a second computer system (see, e.g., specification, page 5, lns. 27-

29). However, confusion may arise, for example, when a user of the first computer system

issues a standard cut/copy command and the information is copied to both a memory buffer in

the switch-box and to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in the first computer system. In this

scenario, when the user indicates that a paste of the copied information is desirable to a

second computer system undesirable results may occur because the copied information is

stored in both the memory buffer of the switch-box and the standard cut-and-paste buffer of

the first computer system (see, e.g., specification, page 6, lns. 20-30).

Independent claims 1 and 12 include the feature of a switch-box including a control,

where it is the control that recognizes a first <u>dedicated</u> predetermined event that <u>results in</u>

<u>information being copied from a first computing system to a memory buffer (or external</u>

<u>buffer) in the switch-box and not to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in the first computer</u>

<u>system</u>. The switch disclosed in the Petersen patent does not include or suggest a control

included in a switch-box that recognizes a first dedicated predetermined event that results in

information being copied from a first computing system to a memory buffer (or external

buffer) in the switch-box and not to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in a first computer system.

Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1 and 12 (and their dependent claims 2-

11 and 3-17) are patentable over the Petersen patent. Likewise, the Petersen patent, U.S.

Patent No. 6,026,433 (hereinafter referred to as "the D'Arlach patent"), U.S. Patent No.

6,172,542 (hereinafter referred to as "the Williams patent") and U.S. Patent No. 5,345,327

(hereinafter referred to as "the Savicki patent"), either taken alone or in combination, do not

teach or suggest the added feature of claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests that

the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over the D'Arlach patent in view of the Petersen patent. Applicant assumes that

dependent claims 3, 6 and13-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over the D'Arlach patent in view of the Petersen patent. Applicant respectfully

traverses this rejection since the Petersen and D'Arlach patents, taken alone or in

combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 18 and 26 for at

least the following reason.

As discussed above, in one embodiment of the invention of the instant application, a

switch-box is used to provide a convenient way to cut/copy information from a first computer

system and to then paste that information to a second computer system (see, e.g.,

12

specification, page 5, lns. 27-29). However, confusion may arise, for example, when a user of the first computer system issues a standard cut/copy command and the information is copied to both a memory buffer in the switch-box and to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in the first computer system. In this scenario, when the user indicates that a paste of the copied information is desirable to a second computer system undesirable results may occur because the copied information is stored in both the memory buffer of the switch-box and the standard cut-and-paste buffer of the first computer system (see, e.g., specification, page 6, lns. 20-30).

Independent claims 18 and 26 include the feature of a switch-box including a control, where it is the control that recognizes a first <u>dedicated</u> predetermined event that <u>results in information being copied from a first computing system to a network cut-and-paste data-structure and not to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in the first computer system</u>. The switch disclosed in the Petersen patent does not include or suggest a control included in a switch-box that recognizes a first dedicated predetermined event that results in information being copied from a first computing system to a network cut-and-paste data-structure and not to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in the first computer system.

For at least this reason, independent claims 18 and 26 (and their dependent claims 19-22, 25 and 27-30) are patentable over the D'Arlach patent in view of the Petersen patent. Dependent claims 3, 6 and 13-17 depend from independent claim 1 and claim 12, respectively. Applicant also asserts that dependent claims 3, 6 and 13-17 are also patentable over the D'Arlach patent in view of the Petersen patent for at least the same reason as described above with reference to independent claim 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants assume that dependent claims 9 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Petersen patent in view of the Williams patent (used as evidence for Official Notice). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection since the Petersen and Williams patents, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claim 1 as discussed above. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 9 and 10 are patentable over the Petersen patent in view of the Williams patent. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants assume that claim 11 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Petersen patent in view of the Savicki patent (used as evidence for Official Notice). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection since the Petersen and Savicki patents, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claim 1 as discussed above. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 11 are patentable over the Petersen patent in view of the Savicki patent. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: March 30, 2005

s/Molly A. McCall/s
Molly A. McCall
Patent Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 46,126
(703) 633-3311

P10854 Reply to Final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

30   MARCH   2005
Date of Deposit

DEBORAH   L.   HIGHAM
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

15
Signature   3-30-05
                                             Date